

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claim 6 have been amended. Claims 1, 2 and 21-24 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 3-20 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is included in this amendment.

The Objection to the Drawings:

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the drawings because reference characters 630 and 650 are shown on the drawings but not mentioned in the specification. Paragraph [0021] of the specification has been amended to appropriately mention reference characters 630 and 650. No change to the drawings is therefore necessary. It is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

The Objection to Claim 6:

At page 2 of the Office Action, claim 6 is objected to because of a dependency error. Claim 6 has been amended to depend from claim 3. It is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection:

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 13 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,697,311 to Kim. Claims 1-2 and 21-24 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; thus, the rejection of claims 1-2 and 21-24 is moot. Regarding claims 3 and 13, this rejection is respectfully traversed. Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each feature recited in the claim, arranged as in the claim.

Claim 3 recites in part, "an optimal path searching unit which uses only an error signal at the region having the maximum likelihood of error determined by the maximum error region determining unit to find a minimum error generation path and to correct a part of the channel signal." Regarding claim 3, the Examiner refers particularly to FIG. 6A and to col. 10, lines 29-51, neither of which makes any reference to an "optimal path searching unit" or to any element which "uses only an error signal at the region having the maximum likelihood of error" to "find a minimum error generation path," as recited in claim 3.

Claim 13 is deemed to be patentable at least for similar reasons set forth above regarding claim 3.

Allowable Subject Matter:

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 14-20 are allowed and that claims 4-12 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Conclusion:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 10/7/05

By: John H. Stowe
John H. Stowe
Registration No. 32,863

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510